

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/458,353	•	12/09/1999	ARTHUR G. ANDERSON	3569	8754
32681	7590	06/14/2006	EXAMINER		INER
PLANTRO	,		MEI, XU		
345 ENCIN P.O. BOX 6		ET	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SANTA CE	RUZ, CA	95060-0635	2615		
				DATE MAILED: 06/14/200	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/458,353	ANDERSON ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
•	Xu Mei	2615				
The MAILING DATE of this communication						
Period for Reply	• •	·				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFI after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re t. riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT atute, cause the application to become ABA	CATION. sply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on $\underline{0}$	<u>3/20/2006</u> .					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice und	er Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)	drawn from consideration.	·				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to be the drawing(s) be held in abeyand rection is required if the drawing(s)	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docum application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in Appriority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date				
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	·	formal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

- 1. This communication is responsive to the applicant's amendment dated 03/20/2006.
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-4, 6-7 and 57-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al (US 6,201,875) in

 view of Zurek (US 5,764,875).

Regarding claims 1-2, 60 and 63, Davis discloses an apparatus comprising: a hearing aid device having a memory (Fig. 6 show the hearing aid having a plurality of memory) for storing a user-adjustable preference setting (hearing aid fitting parameters), the memory being configured to allow the user-adjustable preference setting to be repeatedly modified by the user and stored during use of the hearing aid (col. 6, lines 36-59); and a host adapter (GUI interface of a computer adapted to connected/coupled to the hearing aid series interface circuit)

configured to be selectively coupled to the hearing aid and configured to process audio signals received from or transmitted to the hearing aid using a performance parameter (hearing aid loudness parameter, for example) set in accordance with the preference setting (see col. 3, lines 44-61), wherein the host adapter is capable of accessing the memory in order to read the user-adjustable preference setting (the host computer is capable accessing the hearing aid memory to read and adjust the fitting parameter stored in the hearing aid). The hearing aid fitting system of Davis is also performing hearing assessment of different individual (i.e., second user as claimed) since the host adapter or computer clearly could generate different fitting parameters for different individual. And multiple performing or fitting parameters is stored and loaded into the hearing aid for instantaneous comparison of different fittings (col. 5, line 59-col. 6, line 6) and various information regarding the user or users is also being stored in the hearing aid as shown in Fig. 5.

What Davis does not specifically show is the hearing aid is a headset as claimed. However, hearing aid being constructed as a headset is old and well known in the art. Zurek disclose a hearing aid headset (Fig. 1) with the advantages of more space for signal processing circuitry and controls on the headset

hearing aid can be made larger and therefore easier to use than the typical ear-level hearing aid, for example (col. 2, lines 19-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to modify the hearing aid apparatus of Davis by having a headset hearing aid as shown by Zurek with the advantage more space for signal processing circuitry and controls on the headset hearing aid can be made larger and therefore easier to use than the typical ear-level hearing aid, for example.

Regarding claim 3, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to implemented the memory or other circuitry of the hearing aid anywhere within the headset structures as shown by Zurek.

Regarding claim 4, it's old and well known in the art that memory structure for electronic equipment is mounted in a quick connect/disconnect plug in fashion for the purpose of easy replacement. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to implement the hearing aid memory of Davis in a quick connect/disconnect fashion for the advantage of easy parts replacement.

For what's called for in claim 7, see col. 5, line 40-col. 6, line 6.

For what's called for in claims 6, 61-62 and 64-66, see

Figs. 1-2 and 4. The different tone at different individual

frequencies are shown for dynamic volume or loudness control to

fit different individual. The different levels as claimed are

met by the different frequency curves at various points as

shown.

- 4. Claims 57-59 are similar to claims 60-62 except for being couched in method terminology; such methods would be inherent when the structure is shown in the references.
- 5. Claims 73-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al (US 6,201,875) in view of Zurek (US 5,764,875) as discussed in claim 1 above, and further in view of Martin et al (US-5,210,803).

Regarding claims 73 and 74, the combinations of Davis and Zurek as discussed including all the limitation with the exception of having particular user login for retrieving specific user headset preference settings. Martin discloses a hearing aid device including ID means for allocated to the hearing aid for identification purpose thus preventing hearing aid being wrongly used by a different individual. Davis also discloses the hearing aid fitting system including individual information being stored in the host and audiogram for the

hearing aid user (see Fig. 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to modify the improved headset hearing aid device as taught by the combinations of Davis and Zurek by having ID means (as shown by Martin or user ID login or any other type ID means) for the headset hearing aid in order to prevent the headset hearing aid being wrongly used by different individual.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Bush and Fischer are made of record here as pertinent art to the claimed invention. The cited references disclose different headphone devices including memory being mounted to the headphone device.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Xu Mei whose telephone number is 571-272-7523. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (9:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian Chin can be reached on 571-272-7848. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ø

Page 7

'Xu Mei Primary Examiner Art Unit 2615

06/01/2006